



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/508,991	05/10/2005	Sebastian Hallensleben	2466-130	1361

23117 7590 03/28/2007
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

MANOHARAN, MUTHUSWAMY GANAPATHY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2617

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/28/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/508,991		HALLENSLEBEN, SEBASTIAN	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Muthuswamy G. Manoharan		2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 December 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2,5,10-12,16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lammi et al. (hereinafter Lammi) (WO 01/28273) in view over Asada (US 2001/0041593).

Regarding **claim 1**, Lammi teaches a method of exchanging user-specific data from a mobile network (item 10 in Figure 1) to a service application of an external service provider (item 12 in Figure 1), wherein certain user data is needed by the application for providing a requested service to a mobile user (item 11 in Figure 1), the method comprising the following acts performed by a data control server of the mobile network (items 13-15 in Figure 1; Page 7, lines 25-35):

receiving a service request form the mobile user directed to the service application (items 21 and 22 in Figure 2; Page 8, lines 8-10)

generating a unique Application User Identification (AUID) code which is assigned to a combination of the mobile user and the service application (items 21-24 in Figure 2; Page 8, lines 13-15),

sending the service request and the assigned AUID code (item 28 in Figure 2; "geographical information request containing the anonymous identifier is sent to the location register", Page 8, lines 24-25) to the service application (items 28-31 in Figure 2; Page 8, lines 25-32),

receiving from the application a request for the user data of said mobile user (Page 8, lines 29-32),

retrieving the requested user data based on the received AUID code and sending the user data to the application (page 8, lines 32-34).

The limitation "allowing the service application to receive the requested user data if said assigned AUID code was included in the received user data request" is inherent (Lammi did want to hide the user identifier in order to prevent any third party from obtaining sensitive information resulting from the combination of the identity and the location of the service user (Page 6, lines 33-37). Only if the anonymous identifier matches the user identifier (after using the encryption device) then the geographical information of the service user can be retrieved. Therefore, it is inherent that Lammi teaches, "allowing the service application to receive the requested user data if said assigned AUID code was included in the receiver user data request").

Lammi did not teach specifically random code. However, Soliman teaches in an analogous art random code using encryption algorithm (Paragraph [0037]). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to obtain random code using encryption algorithm based on pseudo random numbers, in order to

provide additional security from eavesdroppers. Also, this modification is well known in the art.

Regarding **claim 2**, Lammi teaches a method, wherein the AUID code is generated in step A) in response to receiving the service request from the mobile user (items 22-26 in Figure 2).

Regarding **claim 5**, Lammi further teaches the method, wherein the AUID code is used by the application for attributing the retrieved user data sent, to the said service upon subsequent access of the mobile user to the same service (Page 6, lines 1-4).

Regarding **claim 10**, Lammi further teaches a method according to claim 1, further comprising determining whether a valid mobile user identity exists that corresponds to the received AUID code in order to check if the application is authorized (items 27-29 in Figure 2).

Claim 11, 18 are rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 1.

Claim 12 is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 6.

Regarding **claim 16**, Lammi teaches a server according to claim 11, further comprising a mobile network interface for receiving service requests from mobile users, and for retrieving user data ("service gateway"; items 14 in Figure 1).

Claims 3,4,13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lammi et al. (hereinafter Lammi) (WO 01/28273) in view over Asada (US 2001/0041593) and further in view over Krishnamoorthy (US 2003/0115201).

Regarding **claim 3**, Lammi in view of Asada teaches all the particulars of the claim except wherein the AUID code is stored in a translation table together with a mobile user identity and an application identity. However, Krishnamoorthy teaches in an analogous art wherein the AUID code is stored in a translation table together with a mobile user identity and an application identity (Paragraph [0042]). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the AUID code is stored in a translation table together with a mobile user identity and an application identity. This modification is a design choice, since it is up to the data base manager to have all the information in one table or in multiple tables from a single or multiple database located in a single or multiple devices.

Regarding **claim 4**, Lammi further teaches a method, wherein the mobile user identity is obtained from the translation table based on the received AUID code, for retrieving the requested user data from a user database in which user-specific data is stored for mobile users being registered in the mobile network (Abstract; "identification database"; item 13 in Figure 1).

Claim 13 is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 3.

Regarding **claim 14**, Lammi teaches a server further comprising a translator for translating AUID codes into mobile user identities and vice versa by checking the translation table (Col. 8, lines 13-20; Col. 9, lines 5-10).

Claims 6-8 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lammi et al. (hereinafter Lammi) (WO 01/28273) in view over Asada (US 2001/0041593) and further in view of King (EP 1081916).

Regarding **claim 6**, Lammi in view of Asada teaches all the particulars of the claim except a method, further comprising checking a permission table specifying the types of user data that each service application is allowed to receive from the mobile network. However, King teaches in an analogous art a method, further comprising checking a permission table specifying the types of user data that each service application is allowed to receive from the mobile network (Page 11, lines 53).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the method of the determining step D) is performed by checking a permission table specifying the types of user data that each service application is allowed to receive from the mobile network. This method provides a method of establishing privacy agreements between the mobile network and the service providers.

Regarding **claim 7**, Lammi in view of Asada teaches all the particulars of the claim except wherein a permission table is maintained for a specific user or group of users. However, King teaches in an analogous art, a method wherein a permission table is maintained for a specific user or group of users (Figure 6). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to (modify the database table of Lammi to further include permission information) use a method wherein a permission table is maintained for a specific user or group of users. It is also inherent that maintaining data in data server implies a designed table in a database that is well known in the art.

Regarding **claim 8**, Lammi in view of Asada teaches all the particulars of the claim except wherein an error message is sent to the service application if the service application is not allowed to retrieve the requested user data. However, King teaches in an analogous art a method, wherein an error message is sent to the service application if the service application is not allowed to retrieve the requested user data (Page 11, lines 35-38). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use a method, wherein an error message is sent to the service application if the service application is not allowed to retrieve the requested user data. This method provides a method of establishing privacy agreements between the mobile network and the service providers.

Regarding **claim 17**, Lammi teaches a server, further comprising an external provider interface for receiving requests for user data from service applications, and for

responding with either the requested data ("location register" and "equipment of the service provider" in Figure 2). Neither Lammi nor Asada teaches specifically a server further comprising an external provider interface for receiving requests for user data from service applications, and for responding with either the requested data or **an appropriate error message**. However, King teaches in an analogous art a server further comprising an external provider interface for receiving requests for user data from service applications, and for responding with either the requested data or **an appropriate error message** (Paragraphs [0055-0057]). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the server further comprising an external provider interface for receiving requests for user data from service applications, and for responding with either the requested data or **an appropriate error message**. This method provides a method of establishing privacy agreements between the mobile network and the service providers.

Claims 9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lammi et al. (hereinafter Lammi) (WO 01/28273) in view over Asada (US 2001/0041593) and further in view of Chung (US 2003/0016823).

Regarding **claim 9**, Lammi in view of Asada all the particulars of the claim except a method wherein new AUID codes are generated by dividing the decimal representation of a non-periodic irrational number into blocks of a certain length, wherein each block is used as an AUID code. However, Chung teaches in an analogous art, a method wherein new AUID codes are generated by dividing the

decimal representation of a non-periodic irrational number into blocks of a certain length, wherein each block is used as an AUID code (Abstract; Figure 4, Paragraphs [0016-18]). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to use the method wherein new AUID codes are generated by dividing the decimal representation of a non-periodic irrational number into blocks of a certain length, wherein each block is used as an AUID code. This modification is useful for providing secure (cryptographic applications) communication.

Claim 15 is rejected for the same reason as set forth in claim 9.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 12/11/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicants assertion on Page 13 with remarks", Applicant's AUID code is generated unique random code, whereas the anonymous identifier of Lammi is derived from the user identifier by encryption".

Applicant's random code is a pseudo random code and is not truly a random code that is based on a pseudo random number. If the code is purely random then one cannot guarantee uniqueness of the code. Providing uniqueness to the random code loses randomness.

Also, encryption algorithms could be based on repeatable random number sequences (2001/0041593, Paragraph [0037]).

Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicants assertion on Page 13 with remarks", Applicant's AUID code represents the combination of a specific user and a

specific service application, whereas the anonymous identifier of Lammi merely represents the user (contrary to the statement in the office action at the top of page 3)".

Lammi's encryption device generates **service-request-specific** anonymous identifier (abstract) and therefore represents the specific service application.

Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicants assertion on Page 13 with remarks", Applicant's AUID code is used to determine whether application is allowed to retrieve the requested user data, whereas no such allowance determination is disclosed whatsoever in Lammi (in Lammi the anonymous is merely to hide the user identifier to avoid exposure thereof)".

Lammi did want to hide the user identifier in order to prevent any third party from obtaining sensitive information resulting from the combination of the identity and the location of the service user (Page 6, lines 33-37). Only if the anonymous identifier matches the user identifier (after using the encryption device) then the geographical information of the service user can be retrieved. Therefore, it is inherent that Lammi teaches, "allowing the service application to receive the requested user data if said assigned AUID code was included in the receiver user data request".

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Muthuswamy G. Manoharan whose telephone number is 571-272-5515. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:00AM-2:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eng George can be reached on 571-272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


GEORGE ENG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER